

AO Simplification Workshop

February 28, 2008

Limit Required Data

- Suggestion: Require only the data necessary to determine cost realism, implementation risk, and mission success risk
 - Emphasis on requirements flowdown to mission implementation (as current – Form B)
 - Proposers address mission implementation at a conceptual level and only give specific data on areas that they identify where implementation might be seen as risky for that particular mission
 - Proposers identify the top risks and mitigation approaches
 - Technical Data Requirements specifically targeted towards cost model input parameters identified and required by the AO
- Increase the number of Step 2 awards to allow for some Concept Studies that fail to demonstrate low risk with more detailed study
- Evaluation would be based on both the TMC assessment of the mission risk and the proposal team's ability to identify risks and mitigations
- Recognizes that missions with low implementation risk in Step 1 will probably find affordable solutions by PDR

Modifications to Step 1 TMC process

- Suggestion: Revise (or remember) instructions to TMC reviewer for Step 1
 - Focus on implementation risk and probability of mission success
 - Consider the probability that the mission can achieve a successful PDR within the proposed cost cap, not whether the proposal has already demonstrated PDR confidence in cost and performance
 - Evaluate the strength of the proposing team based on the approach to identifying and mitigating risk
 - Independently assess cost based on top-level model parameters, suitably modified for heritage and implementation approach
- Keep the attention level of the TMC process on “Major” strengths and weaknesses

Step 1 Feedback

- Suggestion: Communicate Major Weaknesses to proposal teams in advance of selection
 - Use the findings of the evaluation team verbatim
 - Engage the proposal team in a 1-hour telecon to ensure that the weakness is understood
 - Permit the proposal team one page per major weakness to add additional explanation or revision to the proposal
- Requires additional work by the TMC team, but that is offset by simpler initial review
- Ensures that the review does not err through misunderstanding of the proposed approach

Softer Cost Cap

- Suggestion: Identify a total AO cost pool and an anticipated number of flight selections instead of a hard cap
 - Allow proposers to decide what fraction of the total to propose for (instead of \$/n)
 - Mission scale would then be defined by the launch vehicle etc.
- Recognize that SMD AA has a preference for smaller missions
- Permits missions that “almost” fit the cap to be proposed with realistic budgets

Timely AO Release

- Suggestion: Establish a schedule for AO release and stick to that schedule
 - Proposers need at significant lead time (~6 months) to form teams, mature concepts, and develop technical solutions
 - These teams need to be retained and funded until the proposal is submitted, so schedule stretchout causes unanticipated costs
 - Picking a conservative AO release schedule and meeting it is more important than picking an aggressive schedule and missing it